

I would read to the House if time permitted—complaining that while their profit has been reduced by taking off one-half of the protection given them, the duty on the raw materials they use has scarcely been reduced at all. And what do these manufacturers say? They say: We do not want any protection; we go with the farmers for free fertilizers, if the Government will give us free sulphuric acid. The duty has been reduced from five-tenths of a cent to four-tenths of a cent, scarcely any reduction at all. Why do not the Government abolish the duty on sulphuric acid? It is not because they get any revenue from it, for I have looked carefully over the returns and find that the revenue collected last year was a paltry \$800. I ask therefore that the hon. gentleman will consider this, because it is an important question. And when the manufacturers of these fertilizers say they are willing to have free trade, in heaven's name let the hon. gentleman come down and give fair play to both the manufacturers and the farmers, by making raw material free. A special reason is suggested here to-day—and that same reason has been suggested to me in letters which I have now in my hand—that there are people behind the Cabinet, and very near the Cabinet, who have an interest in the manufactory at Capleton, and that the Government will not reduce the duty upon sulphuric acid because this manufactory at Capleton is able to make its own acid and to export it. Of course the hon. gentleman is not aware of it, but I would ask him to look into that question and ascertain why the rest of the people of this country should be taxed in order to support a small industry in a remote part of the province of Quebec. Now, Sir, I think I have got pretty well to the end, and I have no doubt

that you, and the members of the House are very glad to hear me say so. One word, Sir, in conclusion. Hon. gentlemen opposite have come down now with a definite statement of their policy. They have thrown down the gauntlet and declared that they will fight it out on the question of protection or revenue tariff. We join issue with them and we are happy to have the opportunity of fighting that issue out before the people. Whether they will stick to it, or whether before the elections they will fly some new kite, as they did in 1891, I do not know. But of this I am certain, that if they will stick manfully to what they say now is their fiscal policy, and will go to the people upon that issue, Liberals need have no fear of the result. The people are beginning to understand, Mr. Speaker, what the word "protection" means. The great mass of the consumers have learned from the mouth of the Finance Minister himself, by his own admission, that taxation increases the price of commodities. Then, Sir, protection is taxation; taxation of the most obnoxious kind. Taxation means increase of the prices of commodities to the masses, the taking of the wealth of the many for the benefit of the few. It means, as we have seen in this country, the building up of monopoly; it means a blow at the liberty of the subject. And what is the policy on this side of the House? That policy is revenue tariff, a policy under which not one dollar of money shall be taken from the pockets of the people more than goes into the treasury, not more drawn into the treasury than is necessary to carry on the Government economically and honestly. Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation, so far as I am concerned, in awaiting the issue when it shall be tried out before the people of this country.